NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTION

re: **Utilisation of Potential Resources of Cauvery water—Motion to adjourn discussion.**

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—Now may I have your permission to move adjournment of discussion on the resolution moved by Sri H. D. Deve Gowda, as I have to go on some very urgent business. I wish that the Member who has to move the next resolution on border question may move it. My reply to the resolution of Sri Deve Gowda may be taken up at 5 o'clock so that I may come and give the reply. I therefore move with your permission:

"That the debate on resolution moved by Hon'ble Sri H. D. Deve Gowda may be adjourned under Rule 227".

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the purpose of seeking adjournment is only to have a little time to fulfil his engagements and if the Hon'ble Chief Minister will reply at 5 o'clock, then we may agree. I suppose the House agrees to the motion since it does not cause any inconvenience to anybody?

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The debate stands adjourned to be resumed at 5 o'clock. Meanwhile the next resolution will be taken up.

Non-Official Resolution.

re: Making recommendations to Government of India to solve border disputes on the basis of Legistative majority etc.,

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—I beg to move:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of India that the border disputes between Mysore and the adjoining States including Maharashtra be solved on the basis of (*a*) Linguistic majority, (*b*) contiguity, (*c*) village as a unit, and (*d*) wishes of the people, without further delay."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Resolution moved:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of India that the border disputes between Mysore and the adjoining States including Maharashtra be solved on the basis of (*a*) linguistic majority, (*b*) contiguity, (*c*) village as a unit, and (*d*) wishes of the people, without further delay."

I have received notice of amendments. The Hon'ble Member Sri A. P. Appanna is not here. That amendment lapses. Sri A. J. Doddameti will move his amendment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—(1) ಮೊದಲನೇ ಸಾಲನಲ್ಲಿ 'ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರವನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ' ಎಂಬ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕ್ಕತಕ್ಕದ್ದು; (2) ಐದನೇ ಸಾಲಿನಿಂದ ಎಂಟನೇ ಸಾಲುಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ (1) ಭಾಷಾ ಸಂಖ್ಯಾತರು, (2) ಪ್ರಾದೇಶಿಕ ಸಾಮೀಪ್ಯ.....ಜನರ ಅಭೀಷ್ಟ ಎಂಬ ಪದ

ಗಳಿಗೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ, "ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳು ಸಣ್ಣ ಸಣ್ಣ ಗಡಿ ಹೊಂದಾಣಿಕೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉಭಯ ಸಮ್ಮತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾದ ಒಪ್ಪಂದ" ಎಂಬ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"(i) That in line 3, omit the words "including Maharashtra;"

(ii) In line 4, for the words "(*a*) Linguistic majority, (*b*) Contiguity.....wishes of the people"; substitute the words "Mutual agreement to be arrived at between the States concerned in the matter of affecting minor border adjustments wherever found necessary."

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I would like to know whether the rules of procedure would permit the next resolution being taken up when the earlier resolution is not yet over, and if so whether the earlier resolution lapses.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—It was on the motion of the Chief Minister that it was accepted. You were perhaps absent.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I would like to know whether such a motion is admissible in view of the specific rules laid down.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—Rule 277. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ರೂಲ್ 277ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಭೆಯು ಮುಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದರು, ಅದು ನಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಿತು

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Gowda was absent.

† Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—Sir, this is one of the most important resolutions that has been Tabled by us before this Hon'ble House for its consideration. The question is important not only from our point of view, but also from the point of view of those people who are residing outside the areas of these linguistic States. For example, Sir, we have formed this Karnatak State at the strenuous efforts and requests made by people like Sri Doddameti and others to have one State on the basis of Kannad language. They have placed their grievances several times, even during the British regime to have one province with a predominantly Kannad language. Their efforts started about forty to fifty years back and after Independence, everyone in the country has accepted this principle and tried to redress the grievance. Several committees were appointed for the formation of these new States or division of our country into thirteen or fourteen States mainly based upon language. The reports of the several committees, the opinion of experts, all were considered by the Parliament and this State was brought into force. At the same time when old Mysore was made a uni-lingual State in 1956, Bombay was kept as a bilingual State. But the desire of the people has got to be respected, and the rules of the country, the Congress

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

party, came to its senses in 1960 and Bombay State was also divided on the basis of language into Maharashtra and Gujerat.

When Parliament passed these laws, re-organisation of States, it was a very vast and big question. Division of the whole country into several groups of languages certainly was one of the biggest question before our country. At that time several attempts were made as to whether the basis should be taken to be a district or a taluka or a firka or a circle or should we go to the basis, the village. When the country was to be divided into these groups, parliament preferred as the first step to have the district and in exceptional cases to go to the taluka level and not below that. What was done by our Parliament in 1956 as well as in 1960 was proper. But when taluka or district was taken as a basis, we must remember, Sir, that our old taluks or districts or the new taluks or districts were not formed on any scientific basis, nor were they based upon any linguistic considerations at all. We all know that the districts or provinces in the British regime were formed in the order of their success in the various parts of the country, and they divided this country into several provinces and districts with a view to have convenience for their administration. There was no question of people's benefit, people's welfare and people taking part in the administration of the Government. But, after independence of our country, the whole nature changed. Every individual must know what the Government of his State is doing, what is going on in his district or taluka. For that purpose, to enable every individual in this country, the basic principle of one language, one State, was accepted. It was no doubt a good principle. But, at the same time, Sir, when the whole question of the country was before the Parliament, it was impossible for the Government or any committee at that time to divide or demarcate these boundary lines on the basis of village. It was an impossible task. That was why in 1956, the Hon'ble G. B. Pant said in Parliament when we were dividing the country—let this Act come into force and then minor adjustments can be made by the Zonal Councils. This minor adjustment is never intended to mean to limit two miles or 10 miles in area as enunciated or interpreted by our honourable friend Sri Jatti. That was not the intention of Sri Pant. As compared to the whole division of the country into provinces, the demarcation of boundary lines is a minor thing. It may consist of five miles or five furlongs or fifty miles. It does not mean that it only refers to ten miles on either side of the boundary line. This is a wrong interpretation put by this Government on the words used by Sri G. B. Pant. Then, the Zonal Council tried to settle these questions. But, everyone of us knows, Sir, that there was no end of that matter. The present resolution clearly says that it is not only of the Marathi people in the border area, but it is also for the Kannada people that are lying outside the Mysore State.

Sir, I have seen this report of the fact finding committee appointed by the Mysore State before the reorganisation of the State,

That Committee has clearly stated—some portions of their remarks are very important. But, I do not know whether our Government is eager to give any credit to this committee who have reported this matter. I would like to draw the attention of our Government to the remarks made by the Committee. It is a Government's publication and we have nothing to do with it. It was published in the year 1954 when we were not here. On page 1, it says:

"Kanarese is bounded on the north and west by Marathi and its dialect Konkani, on the east by Telugu and Tamil and on the south by Tamil, Kodagu and Tulu."

Now, our friends say that Konkani has nothing to do with Marathi. All men have stated clearly that Konkani is the dialect of Marathi. On page 14 they say:

"Admittedly, Tulu is a dialect of Kannada and is only a spoken language, the script used being Kannada. Konkani is allied to Marathi."

This is the finding given by that committee and it clearly shows that Konkani is not separate from Marathi and it must go with Marathi.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—Our Speaker has said that.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—If our Speaker Sri B. Vaikunta Baliga comes to our area, it is so much good. We welcome him; we would certainly welcome such an intellectual giant. We will never grudge it. But the thing is whether he is willing to come.

Then, on page 4, there is a reference to the Madaksira which is still outside the State and the people of this area are still longing to come to Mysore. What have this Government done regarding the welfare and wishes of these people.

On page 8 a reference is made to Bidar District.

"Nearly half of the Bhalki Tahsil adjoining Nilanga Tahsil is found to be a Marathi-speaking area and is bound to give rise to controversies.

In 1954 this committee has anticipated if those people are not allowed to go to Maharashrta there would be controversy. Further, the committee says:

"Ahmadpur, Udgir and Nilanga Tahsils are overwhelmingly Marathi. Even in the other Tahsils there is a sizeable per centgel of Telugu or Marathi speakers. Without making a detailed linguistic survey, village by village, it is difficult to delimit the linguistic areas in this district."

This principle is applicable not only to Bidar or Bhalki but is applicable to all the districts round about Mysore. This has got to be done by the Government and I do not know whether they have done anything in this matter.

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

On page 9:

"It is interesting to note that there is a sizeable Kannada-speaking population in the Deglur Tahsil of Nanded District which is admittedly a part of Marathwada."

What have our Government done? Have you found out in how many villages Kannada population is there, whether they are contiguous to some area and whether the people of those places desire to come to Mysore or not? In this respect what steps have this Governemt taken? I feel they done nothing and they are sleeping over these issues. Further, the committee says:

"This will leave a population of 1,89,205 Kannada speakers scattered in the other areas of the State outside this region. A Linguistic Map of the Hyderabad State, furnished by the Census Commissioner, Hyderabad, is attached."

According to the information of this Committee, there are still two lakhs of people who are living in the areas lying in Maharashtra. What have you done to help them? This relates to the three districts of erstwhile Hyderabad State.

Regarding the Bombay area, on page 10 the committee says:

"Except in the Talukas of Belgaum and Chandagad, the Kannada speaking population is undoubtedly predominant. In these two taluks however, the Marathi-speaking population accounts for 63.4 per cent. The linguistic affiliation of this area is bound to be open to controversy."

This is the remark made by the committee in 1954. I think the Hon'ble Finance Minister Sri B. D. Jatti will not be justified in blaming us that we are creating new troubles in the border areas.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I have never said that Sri V. S. Patil has created any trouble.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sri Jatti means Government. The Chairman of this Committee was Sri M. Seshadri, a retired Minister of the Government of Mysore.

1-30 P.M.

This is based upon the census of 1951.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—This committee toured North Karnatak and at that time I am sure the committee must have interviewed Sri Doddameti.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Regarding Sholapur District, the committee says:

"It is only in South Sholapur and Akkalkot Taluk the percentage comes to 56.5. Except these two taluks, the rest of the

district must be excluded. Even here, we do not know how the Kannada-speaking population is distributed. Without a detailed survey of villages, it is impossible to say whether any portion might have to be excluded. We, however, consider that these two Talukas must be deemed to be part of the Kannada-speaking area."

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ವಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್. ಅತ್ತ ಕಡೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಯಾರೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ಜತ್ತಿಯವರು ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾರೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ಜತ್ತಿಯವರು ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ಅಂದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಳ ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ?

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಏನೂ ಇರ್ಲಾ.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—This shows that according to this committee at least two taluks ought to have been joined to Mysore and the detailed study that was expected of this committee has not been done by this Government.

Then, further on, it refers to the Sholapur City.

"We observe that out of the total population of 2,66,050 the Kannada speakers account for only 39,359 or 14.81 per cent of the entire population. It is obvious that Sholapur City cannot be recokned as part of the Kannada-speaking area."

As regards South Satara, the committee says :

"Even in these two taluks the Marathi speakers account for 73 per cent. We think that these two taluks also must be excluded."

The have taken taluk as the basis. There are villages just on the border which are predominantly Kannada-speaking. That matter has not at all been enquired into by this Government and I do not think any of our Hon'ble Minister has ever visited any of those villages to enquire into their wellbeing or conditions or wishes. They have not done anything of the sort because they are self-satisfied.

So far as Madras Karnatak is concerned, the committee on page 13 says : "Although there is a Kannada-speaking population of 1,50,000 in the Madras district, this cannot be reckoned as part of Kannada-speaking area on account of the geographical and other considerations."

Then, we come to South Kanara and on page 14 they have referred to Kasargod.

As regards Nilgiris, they have said that it must also be considered. It further says :

"In view, however, of the linguistic distribution of the population, the affiliation of this area is bound to give rise to acute controversy."

(Sri V. S. Patil)

Have they made a regular survey is so how many villages are predominantly Kannada and how many are predominantly non-Kannada and what are the wishes of those people ? Nothing has been done as yet.

Then, the committee refers to Coimbatore. They say that without an intensive survey it is hardly possible to identify the areas in which the Kannada-speaking minorities live. These are the things which ought to have been done by this Government. The people have put them in places of trust and it was their first and foremost duty to make enquiries regarding the areas which are lying just outside the boundary of this State.

On page 15 the committee has referred to Hosur Taluk. There also number of Kannada people are there but they say that without an examination and survey the committee is unable to say the exact number of villages or the population in that area.

On page 18, a reference is made to Anantpur and there the population of Madakasira is given. There, the Kannada population is 65 per cent and still that part has not at all been joined to Mysore. From all this, I should like to ask this Government as to what it is doing for the amelioration of the Kannada people who are residing outside the State. Some of our friends on the opposite side may say, "Why these Maharashtrian people are trying to sponsor the cause of the Kannada people ?" That is because we are feeling the pinch. If a section of the people are kept outside their State, what are their conditions and difficulties and how many troubles they have to undergo we have experienced this for the last 8 years. That is why we are feeling pity for our Kannada brothers who are not included in this State. They must also be suffering the same fate as we are suffering. We are sponsoring the cause of not only the Kannadigas but the cause of all minorities.

I should like to say one word regarding the amendments moved by my friend Sri Doddameti. In the first amendment he has asked for the exclusion of 'Maharashtra'. I do not know what he means by that. I do not know whether it is his intention that Maharashtra has nothing to do with Mysore at all and that it is not even an adjoining State.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ (ರೋಣ್).—ನ್ಯಾಯ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಇದೆ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಒಂದೇ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ನಮೂದಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಗಡಿ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೊಂದೇ ಪ್ರಾಂತವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಹಾರಾಷ್ಟ್ರ ಆಂಧ್ರ ಕೇರಳ ಮದ್ರಾಸು ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೂ ಸಮನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಂದೇ ಪ್ರಾಂತದ ಹೆಸರು ಬಿಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಆ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—If that was his intention, he ought to have asked for the addition of the words Madras, Kerala and Andhra. That would have been proper. He wants all the villages lying outside Mysore State to be included in Mysore and he is rather afraid that others who are non-Kannadigas might put in their claims to those areas. That is why he is afraid to mention the names.

Here, Sir, for the last 8 years these two Governments, the Maharashtra Government and the Mysore Government, are negotiating. They have held several meetings. It was discussed even in the Southern Zonal Council. All these efforts have proved to be fruitless and useless, and that is why we have taken shelter of the basic principles. If this amendment is accepted and if it is to be by mutual agreement of the two Governments, then it is an unending business. It has failed and it has proved to be a complete failure during the last 8 years. It is quite impossible that these two Governments or any government will come to terms with the Mysore Government. We can agree even with foreign governments like England, America or Russia or any other foreign country, but it is very difficult for the Mysore Government to agree with any other government on any reasonable terms because this Government do not know what is reason, what is justice and what is equity. Nothing of that is known to them and that is why they have turned a deaf ear to the cry of the Kannada people lying outside. They are simply seeking their own. I may say that the ruling party men are concerned with their self. They are following "उद्धरेदात्मनात्मानं....." said in Gita just to see that every one individual is benefited. They do not care for anybody, even for their own relations, for their blood relations, for their linguistic relations. They will care for none but themselves and that is displayed during the last 8 years. During all this period they have done nothing for protecting the rights of the people lying outside this State. As a reward for what they have obtained in our border area, they are harassing us for the last 8 years. We have experienced 3 regimes during the last 8 years. The first short regime was that of Sri Nijalingappa. It was a regime of promises without doing anything; the second regime was that of our friend Sri Jatti. His regime was a terrible one. It was a regime of repression to us. We were thrashed; our heads were broken and we were shot down.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—If the head of Sri Patil was shot down or thrashed, he could not have been here now and how could he had spoken here now?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—On the 23rd November 1958 at about 11-00 a.m. in the morning his own District Magistrate came to my house. He called me to help him to pacify the people as some *gadbad* was going on. I was reluctant because I had to go to Bangalore for which I had even reserved my ticket. But just to see that peace is maintained I accompanied him with what result? I persuaded the people to calm down and I drove away some people, but the reward his own police gave me was that they broke my head on the road.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I do not know about the second part, but as regards the first part, what he states is absolutely correct. I have no information about the second part and I cannot say anything without information. As regards the first part, because he is a person who has got influence in the village and because the Government did not want

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

any disturbance in the village they requested him and he went there. He was mainly responsible to help the police to maintain law and order. That is true.

SRI V. S. PATIL.—The District Magistrate himself took me to the Civil Hospital where I was detained over about 20 days as an in-door patient. On the day on which I came back from the Hospital his Sub-Inspector came to my house and arrested me for rioting. That was the ward given by my friend Sri Jatti to me.

The other incident to which I would like to refer took place on the 8th January 1961. On that day there was firing by the police on the people and there was great commotion. So the police wanted me to help them.

I went there and I advised the people. On the one side our people were ready to assault the police and on the other side the police, about 200 strong, were ready to shoot down the people. I was in the middle. At that time I requested the District Magistrate and the S. P. to cool themselves down first and I told them that I would control the mob and asked them to control their organised police. At that moment also we were successful in bringing down and cooling down passions on both sides. This is the way in which our friends regime harassed us. Then, the people had to take not only to peaceful Satyagraha but also ultimately to no-tax campaign. During this campaign this firing incident had taken place even without violence. We have tried other methods which are open to us under the law and which are followed by Gandhian principles to impress upon the Government the wishes of the people. For example, more than thousands and thousands of meetings were held; applications signed by lakhs of people were sent to Delhi, to this Government as well as the Bombay Government. Then ultimately we resorted to Satyagraha. In the Satyagraha movement, at one time about 5000 to 6000 people courted jail. On the second occasion it was more than 16,000 people who courted jail. All these things passed off peacefully. The punishments were from 1 day to 9 months R. I. All this was suffered by the people. Why? Was there any hatred or ill-feeling between Mysoreans and Maharashtrians? Absolutely not. We love Mysoreans as we love Madrasis or Bengalis. But what are the Government of Mysore doing? Are they doing justice? They say that these people are making agitation because outsiders are instigating them. This is really wonderful. Would 16,000 people court jail just because some outsiders came and instigated them? It is an impossibility.

Then elections came. In the elections to local bodies every village panchayat in our area elected Samiti members. The first resolution passed in every village panchayat was that "we want to go to Maharashtra; our village is predominantly Marathi area; we request this Government to give us permission to go to Maharashtra." Then elections to taluk boards were held and then also the Marathi area people returned Samiti members

ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನಪ್ಪ ಪಾಲ.—ಹೋಗಿ ಬೇಡ ಎನ್ನುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಜಮೀನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನಪ್ಪ ಪಾಲ.—ನಿಮಗೆ ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರೀತಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The Taluk Boards of Karwar, Halyal, Supa, Khanapur and Belgaum passed resolutions in some places unanimously and in some places by a majority. All the Marathi people voted for the resolution though the Kannada people there objected to it.

Sri B. P. KADAM (Karwar).—In Halyal they were in favour of it and supported the resolution.

Sri S. V. PATIL.—Then, Sir, regarding elections to this August House, we first had the elections in 1955 when one of the Assembly Members resigned as a protest against the Congress Party of Belgaum because they did not allow him to state before the States Rorganisation Commission that Belgaum part belongs to Maharshtra. As a protest he resigned and there was the first bye-election in Belgaum Taluk. My friend Mr. Samaji stood against a Congress Candidate. Mr. Samaji had learnt upto 5th standard. Against him the Congress set up one of my own relations who is M. A. LL. B.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If M.A.LL.B.s are only eligible for contesting elections, where should others go ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The congress candidate was a Marathi by caste and his mother tongue was Marthi and he was related to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He should not bring in others.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—On behalf of Congress, he was sponsoring! the cause of including the whole of Belgaum District in Karnataka while Mr. Samaji supported by us wanted that village should be taken as unit and that part where there is predominence of Marathi people must be excluded from joining Mysore. On this basis election was fought, and Mr. Samaji was elected in 1955. In 1957, Sir, we had elections in our parts and all the three seats in Belgaum, Nippani as well as Khanapur, Balki and Bidar came to us. So far as Karwar is concerned, there was quadrangular fight and the advantage was taken by the Congress. In 1962, recent elections have taken place. We have regained our seat in Karwar. Mr. Kadam has been retained. There was practically this time a straight fight between the candidate who sponsored Kannada principle and Samithi member. We have retained the seat of Belgaum, Khanapur, Nippani and also Bhalki. All these seats which have been retained in these tracts clearly go to show that the people desire that we must go to Maharashtra. I do not mean to say, Sir, that if that part is joined to Maharashtra, we are going to get heaven. There also the rule is of the same people.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Out of 135 Members of the Congress Party in the Legislature there are hardly 5 members. Should they not listen to what he says ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಒಂದೇ ಅಲ್ಲ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಜನರಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅನಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೆ.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is the party in power leaving alone the Finance Minister ?

Sri V. M. DEO (Gubbi).—I propose that discussion on this resolution be adjourned till tomorrow.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Not when Sri Patil is on his legs.....

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—My grievance is that those people who loudly protest whenever border issue comes up here, should have been here. We want to know the exact position.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—When he gets his chance, he may say all those things.

2 P. M.

Sri S. V. PATIL.—In 1962 elections, the Congress again tried to get some Marathi people to oppose us. But, in spite of their attempt, in spite of money and influence, people returned us to place this view before this August House. That is the mandate given to us by our people and we cannot be faithless to them and to our conscience. That is why we are pleading not only for the Marathi people, but also for the Kannada people to have their places in their respective States. Sir, the attitude shown by this Government regarding this dispute is given by the report of the Maharashtra Boundary Dispute Committee by the Maharashtra Government representative. There were about eleven points before that committee for discussion and those points are really very important. But on all these points, except only the question of contiguity.....

Sri V. M. DEO.—I rise to a point of order. I move that in view of the importance of this question, it is very unseemingly that the members of this Treasury benches are not only absent, but totally absent, except our ex-Chief Minister and the present Finance Minister Mr. Jatti.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no point of order.

Sri V. M. DEO.—In view of this, I move that this House be adjourned or the next two hours to enable all the members to give due importance that the subject really deserves.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—From a point of order, he has gone to a motion.

Sri V. M. DEO.—Except on that basis, how can anybody explain this total absence. I demand—I move that this House be adjourned for the next two hours to enable all the other members to come here and take notice of the discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no point of order.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—There cannot be any objection to put this for the consideration of the House.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—I see a very small clarification from the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He can ask for it after Sri Patil finishes.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Is it correct for the Hon'ble Members to go and take their D. A. without attending the House?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I object to that statement, Sir.

Sri V. M. DEO.—Sir, did you put my resolution to the House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I do not allow that motion and I am not putting that to the House.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—When a motion is moved, it has eighter to be accepted or rejected.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There was no motion. A point of order was raised and I have disallowed it.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Under the provisions, the Chair has to allow.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Certain motions, when they are dilatory, cannot be allowed.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—You should have a uniform law for all the members.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Motions, which are dilatory, cannot be allowed. I am not allowing this motion.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Chief Minister made a motion and it was allowed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No motion was made by Sri. Deo. It was only a representation. It was rejected. Hence Sri Patil can continue

Sri V. M. DEO.—I want to appeal to you Mr. Patil through the Speaker. What is the use of talking when nobody attends so far as this question is concerned. Sir, I would like to bring to your notice rule 277.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Is Sri Patil yielding?

(Sri V. S. Patil was on his legs)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Sri Deo, Should know that Sri Patil is not yelding.

Sri V. M. DEO.—My point of order is not yet finished. I am brining to your notice rule 277.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already stated that there is no point of order. I have also stated that I am not allowing his motion. There is the Minister. He is taking care.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Rule 277 is for a different purpose.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—When it is for a different purpse, I want to know the relationship, or the urgency given to the other resolution under 277 moved by the Chief Minister. How does rule 277 apply to that motion? There was a resolution under discussion. Under the rules of procedure it cannot be adjourned and a fresh resolution brought up. Such a thing is not contemplated under the rules. I therefore submit that the earlier resolution stands adjourned. Unless a fresh notice is given, it cannot be taken up.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Speaker put the matter to the vote of the House and House gave its consent to that motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—We are not discussing that. Let us se that when the time comes.

Sri M. V. DEO.—You have not taken note of the new convention Sir.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—This committee has framed very intelligent and far reaching issues based on sound principles. The first issue is whether it was necessary to make any adjustment in the boundary between the states of Maharashtra and Mysore ? The second is whether it is desirable to make any adjustments in the boundary between the States of Maharashtra and Mysore ?. The third is, should there be any limit up to which those adjustments should be made. The fourth is. should this adjustment be based upon contiguity of territory ?. The fifth one is, would that be what would be the units of such adjustments villages, taluka or district ? Then, what should the linguistic percentage of the population for the transfer of such a unit? Whether administrative convenience should be one of the priniciples to be followed in deciding the transfer of the unit? Whether economic affiliation, etc , as to be consulted? Whether the wishes of the people affected should be one of the principals? And, there are two more. Except contiguity, there was no unanimity between members representing the Goverument of Maharashtra and the members representing this Government. You will be surprised to find that on this issue, No. 9, whether the wishes of the people affected should be one of the principals, the Bombay Government representative firmly admitted that the due weight must be given to the wishes of the people concerned or affected, while our representatives Mr. Channaiya and Mr. S. S. Malimutt said no.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I am seeing only Mr. Jatti for the Treasury Benches. Does it mean that they have boycotted this resolution? Why should the Finance Minister take the trouble to sit here?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He should not raise such things.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I am carefully noting down all the points made by Mr. Patil and I will pass them on to the Chief Minister.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, whenever border issue questions are raised people from the other side jump up. But none of them are here. That means to say that nobody is interested. In this circumstances, what is the use of wasting the time ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—The absence of Congress members can be attributed to two things, one is they might have gone to Lunch arranged in connection with the visit of Sri Ashok Mehta or they must feel that this is a matter which can be left out to Mr. Jatti to do as he likes.

This attitude of the Government of disregarding the wishes of the people is contrary to all principles of democracy. We have pointed out on several occasions that Marathi people are suffering at the hands of the present administration. I can say definitely that not less then 500 gazetted appointments have been made during the last five years by the Government and thousands of persons must have been recruited to Class III and IV posts. I challenge to point out a single instance where Marathi speaking person has been appointed or got into the Government service during this period. Secondly those people who had put in many years of service in Mysore State under His Highness the Maharaja, have been put to irreparable loss due to the conduct and harassment made by

this Government. In the Industries our people would not get any facilities nor any licence, which concession as individual as nationals, of this country they are entitled to get. Further more, all other facilities which are expected to be given to the citizenes of this country are denied to the marathi people. These are the hardships which we have experienced during the last five years and that is why we are pressing this problem not only for Maharashtra people but for all the people either they speak Marathi or Kannada or Telugu or Tamil, whose areas are laying in the borders of other states.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, in the treasury benches excepting the Finance Minister there is nobody.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, does this not mean contempt of this House?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, this is the solitary instance in the history of Mysore Legislature when a motion moved by the opposition member is not give due respect by the treasury benches. With deliberate motive they are absent.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—In my humble opinion this is an utter contempt of the House shown by the Congress members.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—In paragraph 208, the members of the Maharashtra Government have stated:

"What was applicable to the case of Kannadigas then who were linguistic minority at the tail-ends of the Provinces of Bombay and Madras and whose case for a United Karanatak opposed in the name of administrative difficulties and similar grounds, is true of the Kannada speaking people left at the tail-end of Maharashtra and of the Marathi speaking people left at the tail-end of the Mysore State on this border. What is rightfully and justly due to them should not now be opposed in the name of administrative difficulties or such other grounds. We feel sure the Kannada people as a whole will come forward to do unto these people of the border what they had asked for being done unto them before the accomplishment of their goal of United Karanatak. They would thereby keep the promise made by their leaders when they first submitted there case for a United Karanatak before the public in 1928. This promise was "The Kannadigas claim whatever is their own and they are ready to concede the same to others. We appeal to the Mysore Government in the name of the logic, fairness and reasons that they readily concede to these people on the border what the Kannda people in the Mysore State themselves have got by the States Reorganisation Act of 1956. They should revise their stand in regarded to border adjustment and agree to this border being adjusted on the same just and proper basis on which the border between Andhra and

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

Madras had been adjusted. This would be in the best interest of both the States of Mysore and Maharashtra and in the larger interest of the nation."

This is the last appeal made by those people and we fully support the sentiments expressed by those hon'ble members. I appeal to this Government not to try to see that we are being ruled by them. There is a sort of inferiority complex created by this Government and it is not proper for the integration of our country. Now, our people are beginning to think whether we are really independent and whether we have to respect any more Sri Pandit Jawharlal Nehru as the leader of our country, who is judged by the conduct and behaviour of this Government. They are creating hatred even against our leader Sri Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the minds of our people. This is coming in the way of national integration.

One of the Congress members has sent in an amendment for adjourning this subject in the name of national emergency. May I know whether this is national emergency? They are creating this sort of trouble between different States, between our country and other countries, between different kinds of people and between different sections of the people. They are even stopping production in the production centres. All these things are going on and what is the sin committed by the border people that their voice is shut up in this way? Let me conclude by this appeal to the Government. Allow us to live as independent Indians with self-respect and equal status. We are not prepared to submit to tyranny of any kind, liguistic or otherwise.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟ್ಟಿ (ರೋಣ್).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸ್ಥಿರಚಿತ್ತದಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಬಂದು ವಾದದ ಸಮರ್ಥನೆಗೆ ಆಧಾರಪೂರ್ಣಕವಾಗಿ ಏನೊಂದು ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನಾಡಿದರೋ ಅದೇ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳಿದ್ದವು. ಆದರೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೇಕೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅದು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಒತ್ತಿ ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಯಾವುದೆಂದರೆ ಭಾಷಾ ವಿಚಾರ. ಅವರು ಈ ಭಾಷೆ ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಲಾಂಗ್ವೇಜ್ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕವಾದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದನ್ನ ಒಂದು ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದೇ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು.....

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, there is no quorum.

Sri GOPALA SALENNA.—There is no quorun, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is quorum.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, members are standing at the entrance to the House and asking members not to get into the House. Is it fair?

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟ್ಟಿ—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಗಾಗಿ ಭಾರತದಲ್ಲಿ—1953ನೇ ಡಿಸೆಂಬರ್ 29ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾರತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಯ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪುಟ 286ರಲ್ಲಿ (ಬಿ) ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಯ ಕಛೇರಿಯನ್ನವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ—ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂ

ಗಡಣಿಯ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಡಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲವು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವುಗಳು ಯಾವುವೆಂದರೆ :—"ಒಂದು ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಭಾಷೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಯು ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನಜೀವನದ ಸ್ವರೂಪವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಬಿಂಬಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅವು ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅಂಶಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಆದರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಯ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ ಇತರ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳೂ ಇವೆ. ಮೊಟ್ಟಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಅಂಶವೆಂದರೆ ಭಾರತ ದೇಶದ ಒಗ್ಗಟ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ರಕ್ಷಣೆಯನ್ನೂ ಬಲಪಡಿಸುವುದು, ಹಣಕಾಸುಗಳಿಗೆ, ಆರ್ಥಿಕಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ, ಆದಳಿತಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಂಶಗಳೂ, ಒಂದೊಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಒಟ್ಟು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿವೆ. ಭಾರತ ದೇಶವು, ತನ್ನ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ, ಸಾಂಸ್ಕೃತಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ನೈತಿಕ ಪ್ರಗತಿಗಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಸಕ್ರಮವಾದ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಲು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದೆ."

ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ನಾನು ಓದಿದ್ದು ಫಣೀಕರ್ ಅವರ ವರದಿಯಿಂದ—ಇದು ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಡಣೆಯ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟದ, ಪುಟ 286ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅಂದರೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆ ಕೇವಲ ಭಾಷೆಯೊಂದನ್ನೇ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ :—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಈಗ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೋರಂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಎಣಿಸಿ ನೋಡಬಹುದು.... ....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Yes, there is no quorum. The House will now rise and meet at 3-30 P. M.

The House adjourned at Thirty Minutes past-Two of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before I call upon the hon'ble member Sri A. J. Doddameti to speak I am sorry that the House had to be adjourned for want of quorum. Now I suppose there is quorum.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಆಗಲೇ ನಾನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಯಾವ ಫಣಿಕ್ಕರ್ ವರದಿಯ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಪುನರ್ವಿಂಗಡಣೆ ಆಗಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆಯೋ, ಆ ಸಮಿತಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಕೋನವನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಎದುರಿಗೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿತ್ತೋ, ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

Chair's ruling *Re*: the use of the word "wool gathering."

Mr. SPEAKER.—I was just looking out for the hon'ble member Sri Muckannappa in order to give rulings on some points which are pending with me. Tomorrow is the last day and we might be meeting in the morning. I am not going to take a long time over this.

One point is that when Sri Deo was addressing the House he made certain observations to which Sri Muckannappa took objection that personal allegations had been made against him and he said that those allegations were unfounded and that it was absolutely unkind of the other Hon'ble member to have made those allegations and that he was prepared to stand an enquiry and prove that there was no foundation